

IP TMZ letter to court RE: FRCP 72

REPEAT OF OBJECTION

Clarification

Earlier, I have filed a letter to court expressing grievance with the MJ's order, in which I specifically asked the Article III judge for re-decision. It seems this has been ignored.

FRCP 72 (a) Nondispositive Matters. When a pretrial matter not dispositive of a party's claim or defense is referred to a magistrate judge to hear and decide, the magistrate judge must promptly conduct the required proceedings and, when appropriate, issue a written order stating the decision. A party may serve and file objections to the order within 14 days after being served with a copy. A party may not assign as error a defect in the order not timely objected

to. *The district judge in the case **must** consider timely objections and modify or set aside any part of the order that is clearly erroneous or is contrary to law.*

I find, that objection* had been filed within 14 days, and the article III judge must reconsider. This is obligatory. Not discretionary.

I also clarify that I object her order in whole. It is contrary to fact and law. In fact, LDW started her first page with THREE lies. My objection is NOT limited to jurisdiction alone.

TAIMING ZHANG

- * see specifically ECF 102 #2. It titles "letter to JXN" and says "this should be corrected by DC."
- * UNFORTUNATELY, this properly filed objection WAS mislabelled by the clerk, and subsequently ignored by the judge. But it is a properly filed timely objection.
- * The mere fact an appeal was filed changes nothing. It does not alter the obligation of the article III judge under FRCP 72.

